

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 24 2008

REMARKS

This Reply is submitted in response to the final Office Action dated May 14, 2008. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, and 11 remain present in this application. Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, and 12-30 have been currently or previously cancelled. In the present Office Action: claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21, 23-25, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0200486 (hereinafter "Marwaha") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,502 (hereinafter "Natarajan").

At the outset, Applicants again respectfully submit that Marwaha (see Marwaha Figs. 2, 3, and 10) merely discloses converting a received event to a common event format, irrespective of a format of the received event (see, for example, paragraph [0011]). With reference to Fig. 2, as is clearly shown, a listener/receiver 202 is shown as providing input to a data normalization transformer 204. With reference to Fig. 3, each listener/receiver 302 is shown as providing input to a common event format (CEF) translator 304. Similarly, with reference to Fig. 10, each listener/receiver 1002 is shown as providing input to a CEF translator 1004. In contrast, Applicants claimed subject matter as set forth in independent claim 1 only converts a received event to a common event format when the received event is not already in the common event format.

In rejecting above argument, the Office Action stated (at page 14) "Marwaha discloses: 'The following tables show examples of the tokens and their values that may be updated' ([0027], lines 1-2), and see the table below [0027], OriginDateTime, Remarks, 'If the original data/time is present, then that may be used'. Therefore, the process of normalization includes determining whether the format is acceptable. If the format is acceptable, the system uses that value, if the format is not acceptable the normalization phase will update the value."

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misconstrued Marwaha, paragraph [0027] and the table that follows paragraph [0027]. As is clearly stated in Marwaha, see, for example, paragraph [0025], "[i]n [a] data normalization phase, alert messages are translated into a common message string...The data normalization transformer 204 typically gathers information such as the source, type and status of a problem associated with an alert message." Moreover, Marwaha (see, for example, paragraph [0011]) states a "common event format includes a set of tokens, which contain essential information coming from different sources into an enterprise manager. For example, token 'domainClass' may include the type of

domain the alert is associated with, such as MVS and Solaris, while token 'domain' may include the specific source of the alert such as MVSD and Apollo." With reference to Marwaha, paragraph [0027], the permissive language "tokens and their values that may be updated or assigned values" means when information is included in an incoming alert that is associated with one or more tokens, the tokens associated with the information are updated or assigned values. Similarly, when information is not included in the incoming alert that is associated with a token then the token is not utilized. As is specifically noted in paragraph [0027], "not all of the following tokens may be defined during this phase, or additional tokens may be defined during this phase."

With reference to Applicants' Fig. 3 and independent claim 1, as amended, Applicants agree that Marwaha does not teach or suggest, associating an event factory with a directory service, locating the event factory using the directory service, or returning a populated base event incorporated in a content handler from the event factory to an event source. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Natarajan also does not teach or suggest (alone or in combination with Marwaha) a method that includes an event source (e.g., 305) that accesses an event factory (300) to obtain a common base event (340) that is populated and returned to the event source (in the form of a populated based event incorporated in a content handler). With respect to Natarajan (column 7, lines 19-29), Applicants respectfully submit that while policy engine 254 may feedback control information to network elements 204 to control the network elements 204, this does not teach or suggest returning a populated base event from an event factory to an event source. Moreover, it is unclear to Applicants why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan to send a populated base event from an event factory to an event source. That is, Marwaha does not disclose an event factory that services multiple event sources (that is, each Marwaha listener/receiver has a correspond CEF translator) and while Natarajan does disclose a policy engine that controls network elements (according to rules built into the policy engine) based on feedback from the policy engine, Natarajan is feeding back control signals and not populated base events.

With respect to Applicants' independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied art of record (alone or in combination) teach or suggest a method that includes an event source that accesses an event factory to obtain a common base event that is populated and returned to the event source (in the form of a populated based event incorporated

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 24 2008

in a content handler).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' independent claim 1 is allowable over the applied art of record. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3-5, 8, 10, and 11 are also allowable for at least the reason that the claims depend on allowable claims.

Prior to action on this Reply, Applicants again request a telephone interview with the Examiner. The undersigned attorney may be reached at (512) 617-5521.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael R. Long
Reg. No. 42,808
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway, Ste. 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone (512) 617-5521
Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)